

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA  
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS**

455 Golden Gate Avenue  
San Francisco, California 94102-3688

**Report**

TO: Members of the Judicial Council

FROM: Court Executives Advisory Committee  
Alan Slater, Chair  
Marlene Hagman-Smith, Committee Staff, 415-865-7617,  
[marlene.smith@jud.ca.gov](mailto:marlene.smith@jud.ca.gov)

DATE: September 15, 2003

SUBJECT: Court Executives Advisory Committee and Conference of Court  
Executives Rules of Court (amend Cal. Rules of Court, rules 6.31,  
6.48, and 6.49)

---

Issue Statement

California Rule of Court, rules 6.48 and 6.49 created the Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC) and the Conference of Court Executives (CEAC) as mechanisms for improving trial court administrator's access to and participation in the Judicial Council decision-making process. The CEAC is charged with the unique responsibility of providing advocacy for all of California's trial court executive officers. This advocacy is achieved by creating a conduit of information and participation for the COCE in any statewide court management initiatives that are in the making.

The rules of court need to be updated to not only be consistent with the governance and appointment of other Judicial Council advisory committees, but to include additional administrators from other sections of the judicial branch who could contribute to the discussions and projects that affect court administration.

Recommendation

The Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC) recommends that the Judicial Council, effective January 1, 2004;

1. Amend rules 6.31, 6.48, and 6.49 as they relate to the selection, governance and membership of the CEAC and COCE.

The texts for the proposed amendments to the rules are attached at pages seven through eleven.

#### Rationale for Recommendation

##### 1. Rule 6.31, [Advisory committee membership and terms]

- Subsection (c ) would be amended to allow the Chief Justice to appoint the chair and vice-chair of the committee for a two-year term rather than allowing the CEAC to appoint its own chair and vice-chair.

Rule 6.31 would be amended to align the committee chair and vice-chair appointments with those of other Judicial Council advisory committees. Rule 6.31 (c ) would allow the Chief Justice to appoint the chair and vice-chair (for two year terms) rather than allowing CEAC to appoint its own chair and vice-chair. This change brings rule 6.31 into conformance with new parameters found in rule 6.48.

##### 2. Rule 6.48. [Court Executives Advisory Committee]

- Subsection (b) would be amended to add an additional duty to periodically meet with the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) Directors. This amendment would be made in order to enhance branch communications between the AOC and the CEAC as the COCE's leadership body.
- Subsection (d) would be amended to reduce the current 23-committee member configuration and establish a 19-member advisory committee with representation from specific court sizes. The 19 members would be comprised of the following:
  - \* Nine members from the trial courts with 48+ judges;
  - \* Four members from the trial courts with 16-47 judges;
  - \* Two members from the trial courts with 6-15 judges;
  - \* Two members from the trial courts with 2-5 judges;
  - \* One member from the six clerk administrators of the courts of appeal; and
  - \* One at-large member appointed from the trial courts by the committee chair.

These proposed amendments are recommended by CEAC in order to facilitate the greatest amount of participation by all CEO's in the state and encourage input from all perspectives, especially those that are based on court size. The proposed changes to rule 6.48 (d) would largely affect the

overall size and composition of the committee. The at-large member appointment by the committee chair is recommended by CEAC to allow the chair the flexibility to add an additional member that could off-set or balance out representation on the committee. Balance could be achieved in either court type (i.e., urban, suburban, or rural) or geographic representation as well as representation in a specific area of court administration. The at-large member position would serve a one-year appointment and would provide additional executive officers exposure to a council advisory committee. These changes are also an outgrowth of a recent review by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee of the composition, membership, and governance of each advisory committee for streamlining in light of budget constraints.

- Subsection (e) would be amended to refine the current nominations process for membership to the CEAC and membership to other advisory committees for vacant court executive or judicial administrator positions. This amendment is proposed in order to bring rule 6.48 into conformance with new parameters found in rule 6.49 that no longer allows the CEAC chair to appoint a nominations subcommittee to review applications for CEAC membership or vacant judicial administrator positions on other council advisory committees. This authority to review nominees would now be vested with the reconstituted CEAC.
- Subsection (f) would be amended to allow for the appointment of committee chair and vice-chair by the Chief Justice rather than allowing the CEAC to elect its own chair and vice-chair. This amendment is proposed in order to bring rule 6.48 into conformance with new parameters found in rule 6.31.

### 3. Rule 6.49. [Conference of Court Executives]

- Subsection (c) would be amended to include clerk administrators of the courts of appeal as members of the COCE. This section would be amended to include court of appeal administrators in the membership of the COCE, who could contribute to the discussions and projects that affect court administration.
- Subsection (d) would be amended to allow the chair and vice-chair of the CEAC to serve as the chair and vice-chair of the COCE. This amendment to subsection (d) is a technical change to insure that the chair and vice-chair of the CEAC will remain as the leadership of the COCE. The previous version of the rule text was construed to mean the opposite.

- Subsection (f) would be amended to refine the nominations process for membership to the CEAC and membership to other advisory committees for vacant court executive or judicial administrator positions. This amendment is proposed in order to no longer allow the CEAC chair to appoint a nominations subcommittee to review applications for CEAC membership or vacant judicial administrator positions on other council advisory committees. This authority to review nominees would now be vested with the reconstituted CEAC.
- Subsection (g) would be amended to clarify COCE meeting requirements. This amendment is proposed in order to set apart statewide meeting requirements from regional meeting requirements.
- Subsection (h) would be amended to clarify travel reimbursement to attend meetings. These reimbursement policies are clarified in this rule because funding for meeting costs for the reconstituted COCE will come from two different funding sources, the Judicial Administration and Efficiency Modernization Fund and the General Fund. Reimbursement for meeting travel per diem expenses for conference members will, therefore, be subject to the availability of funds from these two funding sources.

#### Alternative Actions Considered

In late April and early August 2003,<sup>1</sup> the committee circulated proposed amendments to rules of court 6.31, 6.48, and 6.49. Rule 6.48, during these two review periods, outlined a different committee membership configuration and proposed a smaller number of CEAC members to represent the larger courts in the state (48+ judge category.) Under the original proposal circulated for comment, the CEAC membership configuration would have consisted of the following:

- Seven members from the trial courts with 48+ judges;
- Four members from the trial courts with 16-47 judges;
- Two members from the trial courts with 6-15 judges;
- Two members from the trial courts with 2-5 judges;
- One member from the six clerk administrators of the courts of appeal; and
- One at-large member appointed from the trial courts by the committee chair.

Based on input received from the council's Executive and Planning Committee in late August 2003, CEAC reconsidered whether seven committee members

---

<sup>1</sup> The history of the April 2003 review period and an August 2003 review period are described in this report under the section titled *Comments From Interested Parties*.

representing the larger courts was adequate representation given the amount of judicial officers found in courts this size.

The CEAC reviewed the Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee's Executive Committee governance structure as contained in rule of court 6.46 as a model for representation for committee membership based on trial court size categories. There was significant opposition amongst the CEAC members to changing the recommendation for committee membership configuration in the large court size category. Some CEAC members believed that seven CEAC members representing the larger courts was adequate representation and that adding additional members to this court size category would dilute the original intent to decrease the full committee membership in response to the current statewide fiscal crisis.

In September, the CEAC met to consider a motion to change the original court size committee representation and have nine CEAC members represent the large court size category in order to provide more adequate representation and voice to larger court needs and issues. After a final vote of thirteen votes in favor and three votes against, the CEAC approved the motion. Under this new CEAC recommendation, nine large court representatives would be representing the needs and views of courts that serve a total of 1338 judicial officers, while four mid-sized court representatives would be representing the needs and views of courts that serve a total of 354 judicial officers, two smaller-sized court representatives would be representing the needs and views of courts that serve a total of 188 judicial officers and the smallest sized-court representatives would be representing courts that serve 65 judicial officers. The nine largest courts in the state also represent approximately 69 percent of California's trial court judiciary.

#### Comments From Interested Parties

The amended rules were first submitted to the council's Rules and Projects Committee (RUPRO) in April 2003 for approval to circulate for comment. Staff requested, and RUPRO approved, a limited circulation of the amendments to all trial court executive officers and court of appeal clerk/administrators as the interested parties.

In response to the comments received in April, the CEAC voted to form a working group of ten CEAC members and one COCE member to further discuss the selection, governance and membership of the COCE and the CEAC. In late June 2003, the 11-member working group met for the first time to discuss alternatives for restructuring the COCE and CEAC. The rule amendments from this working

group were circulated again in early August 2003 to the trial court executive officers and court of appeal administrators.<sup>2</sup>

During the early August 2003 review period, the proposed rule amendments received a total of six comments. Five commentators agreed that the rule should be adopted without further comments. One commentator agreed that the rule should be adopted subject to modification. This person suggested that rule 6.48 subsection (f) (Chair and Vice-chair) should be modified to not require the Chief to appoint the CEAC chair and vice-chair from "one of the court executive officers who currently serve as an advisory member of the Judicial Council." The commentator felt that this requirement was too restrictive and that since the proposal already reduces the number of CEAC members, the requirement that the chair and vice-chair be selected from advisory members to the council would further reduce the number of different court executives who serve on statewide committees.

The CEAC agreed with this modification. Upon reflection, the CEAC thought that limiting the chair and vice chair to Judicial Council advisory members seemed contrary to the original spirit of the rule amendments, which was to align the CEAC chair and vice-chair appointment authority and tenure with other Judicial Council advisory committees. No other council advisory committee chair currently enjoys automatic membership on the council other than the Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee (TCPJAC.)

A chart summarizing the comments received during the April and August 2003 comment periods and the committee's responses are attached at pages 12 through 19.

#### Implementation Requirements and Costs

Committee costs would be reduced if the rule amendments were approved. Since the membership of the CEAC and COCE are proposed to be reduced, travel costs and associated committee-related costs would be reduced proportionally. The CEAC recommends decreasing its own and the COCE's membership during the current statewide budget crisis. The council's Executive and Planning Committee has already considered methods to decrease the size of council advisory committees, task forces, and other special groups in response to budget constraints. The CEAC hopes that this recommendation will assist in that effort.

---

<sup>2</sup> The proposed amendments reviewed by the trial court executive officers and the court of appeal administrators in April and August of 2003 contained the original CEAC committee membership configuration recommendation that proposed seven CEAC members representing the large court size category as well as a recommendation to appoint the committee chair from one of the court executive officer advisory members sitting on the Judicial Council.

Rule 6.31 of the California Rules of Court would be amended effective January 1, 2004, to read:

**Rule 6.31. Advisory committee membership and terms**

- (a) **[Membership]** The membership of each committee is specified in the rules in this chapter. Advisory committee members do not represent a specific constituency but ~~shall~~ act in the best interests of the public and the entire court system.
- (b) **[Terms]** The Chief Justice appoints advisory committee members for three-year terms unless another term is specified in these rules. Terms are staggered so that an approximately equal number of each committee's members changes annually.
- (c) **[Chair and vice-chair]** The Chief Justice appoints an advisory committee member to be a committee chair or vice-chair for a one-year term; except for the Court Executives Advisory Committee, which may be appointed for a two-year term. ~~This subdivision does not apply to the chair and vice-chair of the Court Executives Advisory Committee., which may chose its own chair and vice chair.~~
- (d) **[Advisory members]** Upon the request of the advisory committee, the Chief Justice may designate an advisory member to assist an advisory committee or a subcommittee. Advisory members may participate in discussions and make or second motions but cannot vote.
- (e) **[Termination of membership]** Committee membership terminates if a member leaves the position that qualified the member for the advisory committee unless the Chief Justice determines that the individual may complete the current term.
- (f) **[Vacancies]** Vacancies shall be filled as they occur according to the nomination procedures described in rule 6.32.
- (g) **[Retired judges]** A judge's retirement does not cause a vacancy on the committee if the judge is eligible for assignment. A retired judge who is eligible for assignment may hold a committee position based on his or her last judicial position.

Rule 6.48 of the California Rules of Court would be amended effective January 1, 2004 to read:

**Rule 6.48. Court Executives Advisory Committee**

- (a) **[Area of focus]** The committee ~~shall~~ make recommendations to the council on policy issues affecting the trial courts.
- (b) **[Additional duties]** In addition to the duties specified in rule 6.34, the committee ~~shall~~ must:
- (1) Recommend methods and policies to improve trial court administrators' access to and participation in council decision making;
  - (2) Review and comment on legislation, rules, forms, standards, studies, and recommendations concerning court administration proposed to the council;
  - (3) Review and make proposals concerning the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System or other large-scope data collection efforts;
  - (4) Suggest methods and policies to increase communication between the council and the trial courts; and
  - (5) Serve as the Executive Committee for the Conference of Court Executives, as described in rule 6.49; and
  - (6) Meet periodically with the Administrative Office of the Courts Directors to enhance branch communications.
- (c) **[Consultation with Conference of Court Executives]** To assist it in formulating proposals and recommendations to the council, the committee may seek the advice of the Conference of Court Executives.
- (d) **[Membership]** The committee shall consist of the following members;
- ~~(1) — Up to 22 court administrators or executive officers, including;~~
  - (1) Nine executive officers from trial courts that have 48 or more judges;
  - (2) Four executive officers from trial courts that have 16 to 47 judges;
  - (3) Two executive officers from trial courts that have 6 to 15 judges;
  - (4) Two executive officers from trial courts that have 2 to 5 judges;



1  
2 (5) One member from the six clerk administrators of the courts of appeal  
3 selected from three nominations made by the Appellate Court Clerks  
4 Association; and

5  
6 (6) One at-large member appointed from the trial courts by the  
7 committee chair for a one-year term.  
8

9 ~~(2) One appellate court clerk or administrator selected from three~~  
10 ~~nominations made by the Appellate Court Clerks Association.~~  
11

12 (e) **[Nominations]** The Conference of Court Executives ~~shall~~ must submit to  
13 the Court Executives Advisory Committee ~~Executive and Planning~~  
14 ~~Committee of the Judicial Council~~ a list of three nominationees for each  
15 vacancy on the committee. The Court Executives Advisory Committee will  
16 recommend three nominees for each committee vacancy from the  
17 nominations received and submit their recommendations to the Executive  
18 and Planning Committee of the Judicial Council. The list of nominees ~~shall~~  
19 must enable the Chief Justice to appoint a committee that reflects a variety  
20 of experience, expertise, ~~court sizes~~, and types (e.g., urban, suburban, and  
21 rural) ~~as well as small, medium, and large~~, that is geographically balanced.  
22 Membership on this committee ~~shall~~ does not preclude appointment to any  
23 other advisory committee or task force.

24 (f) **[Chair and vice-chair]** The Chief Justice appoints the chair and vice-chair  
25 of the committee for a two-year term from the current membership of the  
26 Court Executives Advisory Committee. ~~committee may elect its chair and~~  
27 ~~vice chair.~~  
28

Rule 6.49 of the California Rules of Court would be amended effective January 1, 2004, to read:

**Rule 6.49. Conference of Court Executives**

(a) **[Function]** The functions of the Conference of Court Executives are to:

- (1) Increase the opportunities for court executive officers to participate in the Judicial Council decision-making process; and
- (2) Provide a forum for the education of court executives.

(b) **[Duties]** The Conference of Court Executives ~~shall~~ must:

- (1) Provide information and advice, when requested, to the Court Executives Advisory Committee; and
- (2) Conduct educational sessions for its members on matters related to court management, such as legislation, training, information management, judicial branch policy issues, professional development, best practices, and current issues facing the trial courts.

(c) **[Membership]** All court executive officers and clerk administrators of the courts of appeal are ~~principal~~ members of the Conference of Court Executives. ~~Chief deputies (or their equivalents) are associate members of the Conference of Court Executives. Each principal member is entitled to one vote. Associate members may fully participate in conference meetings but may not vote or make or second motions. However, a~~ A court executive who is unable to participate in a meeting may designate his or her deputy to vote in his or her place.

(d) **[Chair and vice-chair]** The chair and vice-chair of the Court Executives Advisory Committee ~~conference~~ are the chair and vice-chair of the conference. ~~Court Executives Advisory Committee.~~

(e) **[Executive Committee]** The Conference's Executive Committee is the Court Executives Advisory Committee. The Executive Committee ~~shall~~ must

- (1) Establish the schedule and agenda for meetings; and
- (2) As necessary, appoint subcommittees consisting of principal and associate members of the Conference.

- 1  
2 (f) **[Nominations subcommittee]** The Court Executives Advisory Committee  
3 ~~chair shall appoint a Nominations Subcommittee to~~ must submit to the  
4 Executive and Planning Committee of the Judicial Council nominations for  
5 members of the committee, the advisory members of the Judicial Council  
6 who are court executives, and members of other advisory committees who  
7 are court executives or judicial administrators.  
8
- 9 (g) **[Meetings]** The conference ~~shall~~ must meet during at least two statewide  
10 meetings ~~three times~~ a year. One meeting must be held at the annual  
11 California Judicial Administration Conference. The conference must also  
12 meet at least two times a year by region for court administration updates,  
13 focused discussions, and educational opportunities. ~~and one shall be held~~  
14 ~~after the conclusion of the regular legislative session.~~  
15
- 16 (h) **[Reimbursement for meetings]** Reimbursement for meeting travel per  
17 diem expenses for conference members will be subject to availability of  
18 funds.  
19

**SP03-03**

Proposed Amendments to Rules of Court Regarding the Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC)  
Chair Appointments and Terms and the  
Conference of Court Executives (COCE) Membership (amend Cal. Rules of Court, rules 6.31, 6.48, and 6.49)  
**April 2003**

	<b>Commentator</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Comment on behalf of group?</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
1.	Ms. Rachelle Agatha Court Executive Officer Superior Court of California, County of Amador	AM	N	I would like to agree with Gary Blair's comments.	<p><b>As a result of the following comments received during this April 2003 review period, a working group comprised of ten (10) CEAC members and one (1) COCE member was formed in order to revise the rule of court amendments consistent with some of the comments submitted during this review period.</b></p> <p><b>This CEAC/COCE rules working group substantially changed the content of the amendments and re-circulated the proposal to the COCE and court of appeal administrators in August 2003. The comments submitted during the August 2003 review period are attached to this staff report as well.</b></p>
2.	Ms. Tamara Beard Court Executive Officer Superior Court of California, County of Fresno	A	N	In order for the Chief Justice to accomplish all of his goals for California's courts, he must have the final decision as to the CEAC chair. In reality, this would not diminish the "voice" and opinion of the vice chair and other members. I cannot imagine the Chief appointing someone who would not be open and receptive to all points of view and making sure that these thoughts and concerns are relayed to the Judicial	

**SP03-03**

Proposed Amendments to Rules of Court Regarding the Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC)  
Chair Appointments and Terms and the  
Conference of Court Executives (COCE) Membership (amend Cal. Rules of Court, rules 6.31, 6.48, and 6.49)  
**April 2003**

	<b>Commentator</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Comment on behalf of group?</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
				Council.	
3.	Mr. Gary M. Blair Executive Officer Superior Court of California, County of Santa Barbara	AM	N	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I agree that it is important that the Clerk-Administrators of the Courts of Appeal are represented in the governance structure for California court administration. I strongly support the related rule changes to accomplish this, as proposed.</li> <li>2. Why and by whom has it been suggested that the Chair of only the CEAC should serve a term that is apparently twice as long as the term of other Judicial Council advisory committee chairs?</li> <li>3. These proposals do not seem truly critical however. In my opinion, what is more important is the fact that the entire structure of CEAC and COCE for any effective work with the AOC and the Judicial Council is becoming unnecessarily confusing and cumbersome.</li> <li>4. Make COCE the advisory body to the Council (with whatever title, but eliminate CEAC as such);</li> </ol>	

**SP03-03**

Proposed Amendments to Rules of Court Regarding the Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC)  
Chair Appointments and Terms and the  
Conference of Court Executives (COCE) Membership (amend Cal. Rules of Court, rules 6.31, 6.48, and 6.49)  
**April 2003**

	<b>Commentator</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Comment on behalf of group?</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
				<p>5. Create an “Executive Committee” of perhaps 8 or 10 members, <u>to be elected by the 58 COCE members</u>; and</p> <p>6. Make the chair of the Executive Committee (and thus of COCE) appointed by the Chief from within those elected Executive Committee members.</p>	
4.	Ms. Tina M. Burkhart Court Executive Officer Superior Court of California, County of Glenn	AM	N	I concur whole-heartedly with Gary Blair’s recommendations for changes to the proposed rules.	
5.	Ms. Tania Ugrin Capobianco Court Executive Officer Superior Court of California, County of Mendocino	A	N		
6.	Ms. LaRayne Cleek Court Executive Officer Superior Court of California, County of Tulare	A	N		
7.	Ms. Lyla Corfman Court Executive Officer	A	N	I personally find nothing wrong with the proposed rule amendment.	

**SP03-03**

Proposed Amendments to Rules of Court Regarding the Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC)  
Chair Appointments and Terms and the  
Conference of Court Executives (COCE) Membership (amend Cal. Rules of Court, rules 6.31, 6.48, and 6.49)  
**April 2003**

	<b>Commentator</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Comment on behalf of group?</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
	Superior Court of California, County of Imperial				
8.	Ms. Barbara Fox Court Executive Officer Superior Court of California, County of Santa Cruz	A	N		
9.	Mr. Larry Gobelman Court Executive Officer Superior Court of California, County of Syskiyou	A	N	1. I agree with the continuity of two-year terms.  2. I have no problem with the Chief Justice, as chair of the Judicial Council, selecting the CEAC chair (which is advisory to the council) for consistency reasons.	
10.	Ms. Denise Gordon Court Executive Officer Superior Court of California, County of Sonoma	A	N	I concur with the changes. Thanks for the opportunity to comment.	
11.	Ms. Tressa Kentner Court Executive Officer Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino	AM	N	1. I agree with the proposed changes to rules 6.31 and 6.48. 2. I do not agree with the proposed changes to 6.49. Although I understand the desire to be more inclusive, I do not think we should be increasing the COCE membership (and the subsequent travel costs for more committee members) during the current budget crisis. The council's Executive and Planning Committee is considering methods to decrease the size of council advisory	

**SP03-03**

Proposed Amendments to Rules of Court Regarding the Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC)  
Chair Appointments and Terms and the  
Conference of Court Executives (COCE) Membership (amend Cal. Rules of Court, rules 6.31, 6.48, and 6.49)  
**April 2003**

	<b>Commentator</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Comment on behalf of group?</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
				committees, task forces and other special groups in response to budget constraints. Increasing the COCE is contrary to that effort. This proposal could be considered in the future when the budget situation is more positive.	
12.	Mr. Steve Konishi Court Executive Officer Superior Court of California, County of Yuba	AM	N	I concur with the recommendations submitted by Gary Blair on May 1, 2003.	
13.	Mr. Len LeTellier Court Executive Officer Superior Court of California, County of Sutter	AM	N	I agree with the comments submitted by Gary Blair, CEO, Santa Barbara. CEAC should be expanded to include all 58 courts. With the exception of the chair, the Executive Committee should be chosen by CEAC members.	
14.	Mr. Stephen V. Love Executive Officer Superior Court of California, County of San Diego	A	N		
15.	Mr. Michael D. Planet Court Executive Officer Superior Court of California, County of Ventura	A	N		
16.	Mr. Alan Slater Chair Court Executives Advisory Committee	A	N		



**SP03-03**

Proposed Amendments to Rules of Court Regarding the Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC)  
Chair Appointments and Terms and the  
Conference of Court Executives (COCE) Membership (amend Cal. Rules of Court, rules 6.31, 6.48, and 6.49)  
**April 2003**

	<b>Commentator</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Comment on behalf of group?</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
17.	Ms. Peggy Thompson Court Executive Officer Superior Court of California, County of San Mateo		N	I would be interested in knowing if there has been problems that have given rise to the proposed changes.	
18.	Ms. Mary Beth Todd Court Executive Officer Superior Court of California, County of Calaveras	AM	N	I concur with the comments submitted by Gary Blair, CEO, Santa Barbara.	

**SP03-03**

Proposed Amendments to Rules of Court Regarding the Court Executives Advisory Committee  
Chair Appointments and Terms and the  
Conference of Court Executive Membership (amend Cal. Rules of Court, rules 6.31, 6.48, and 6.49)  
**August 2003**

	<b>Commentator</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Comment on behalf of group?</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Proposed Response</b>
1.	Mr. Gary M. Blair Executive Officer Superior Court of California, County of Santa Barbara	A	N		
2.	Mr. Steve Bouch Court Executive Officer Superior Court of California, County of Napa	A	N		
3.	Mr. Dwight Clark Court Executive Officer Superior Court of California, County of Humboldt	A	N		
4.	Ms. Tressa Kentner Court Executive Officer Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino	A	N		
5.	Mr. Joseph Lane Court Administrator Second District Court of Appeal	AM	N	<p>The only comment I would suggest concerns Rule 6.48 Section (F) [Chair and Vice-chair] Wherein it states that the Chief appoints the chair and vice chair from "one of the court executive officers who currently serves as an advisory member of the Judicial Council." I oppose this.</p> <p>This limits the number of Court Executives who serve on committees. The proposal already reduces the number of members of the committee and the</p>	<p>Agree. See proposed changes to rule 6.48, sub section (f) [Chair and Vice-chair.] The original recommendation seemed contrary to the original spirit of the rule amendments, which was to align the CEAC chair and vice-chair appointment authority and tenure consistent with other Judicial Council advisory committees.</p>

**SP03-03**

Proposed Amendments to Rules of Court Regarding the Court Executives Advisory Committee  
Chair Appointments and Terms and the  
Conference of Court Executive Membership (amend Cal. Rules of Court, rules 6.31, 6.48, and 6.49)  
**August 2003**

	<b>Commentator</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Comment on behalf of group?</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Proposed Response</b>
				requirement that the chair and vice be selected from advisory members to the council further reduces the number of DIFFERENT court execs who serve on statewide committees.	
6.	Mr. Gordon Park-Li Court Executive Officer Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco	A	N		
7.	Mr. Michael Tozzi Court Executive Officer Superior Court of California, County of Stanislaus	A	N		